SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. VI, No. 4 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | March 1, 1976

AAAS Votes Role in Aid of "Whistle-Blowing" Scientists

Boston. After handwringing for six years over the problem of what it might do to help scientists who follow their consciences and lose their jobs, the American Association for the Advancement of Science is about to give birth to a non-heroic solution, namely: encourage the 290 or so affiliated societies of the AAAS to set up committees on the subject.

The dilemma of "whistle-blowing" scientists has been gnawing at the Association as the result of occasional cases in which scientists have suffered for speaking out on matters of public interest involving their professional competence. Non-combative by nature, the AAAS has tended to shun such matters, but with the rise of public-interest movements and much recent mouthing about the ethical responsibilities of scientists, the organization has found it embarrassing to remain aloof from at least a minimal role in protecting its constituents.

Association Chief Urges Hands off Science *Magazine—Page 6*

In characteristic toe-in-the-water fashion, the AAAS in 1970 set up a Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, from which virtually nothing was heard until last May, when *Science* carried a report of the Committee, prepared by John T. Edsall, emeritus professor of biology at Harvard. The gist of the report was that the AAAS and other scientific societies ought to recognize the need for protecting so-called whistle blowers, but that the task was a difficult one and no easy solution was available.

Following that publication, the AAAS Board set up a small group, chaired by Edward E. David Jr., former White House science adviser, to report on options for action. And then in December, a day-long workshop was held to examine the options and work out recommendations.

As summarized in a AAAS staff paper, the recommendations were pretty tame, so much so, in fact, that Edsall expressed strong reservations about them.

Thus, the recommendations called for the AAAS to make permanent the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, and assign it to "Actively encourage the affiliated societies to establish committees on scientific freedom and responsibility that would be responsible for formulating, reviewing, defending, and enforcing codes of professional rights and ethics." The committee would also serve as a "clearinghouse" for information on freedom and responsibility, organize conferences, and prepare an "annual review of the state of scientific freedom and responsibility in the United States and the world."

At the December workshop, Edsall presented a paper in which he stated, "On further thinking, since our report was written, I wonder increasingly about our proposals to make the scientific societies the spearhead of the defense of the public interest, in matters of scientific freedom and responsibility. Will the individual professional societies rise to the call, particularly since the AAAS has decided that it should not play an activist

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Rumors persist that Frank Rauscher is planning to leave the directorship of the National Cancer Institute in June. An assistant to Rauscher told SGR, "He will stay to June, maybe later," but insists that he has no specific departure plans. She added that, with five children, including two in college, Rauscher feels pinched by his $37,800 federal salary and his decision hinges on hopes for an increase. If that's the case, he's likely to leave, since a 5 per cent salary increase—the first since 1969—barely squeaked past Congress last year, and a quick followup would be politically embarrassing.

Meanwhile, the new director of NIH, Donald Fredrickson, has taken a favorable but cautious approach to efforts to eliminate the Cancer Institute's privileged status within NIH. In response to a question, Fredrickson told a press briefing at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, "Thus far, the special relationship of NCI to NIH has not been disruptive . . . Cancer has not strayed from the fold, but in a few years, I would like to see it re-merged with NIH."

N. Bruce Hannay, a vice president of Bell Labs, has been appointed foreign secretary of the National Academy of Engineering, succeeding Bruce S. Old, a vice president of Arthur D. Little, Inc., who held the post since 1970.

NSF to Give Supergrant—Up to $150,000—As Annual Prize

The crowded field of scientific and engineering prizes is about to be enlarged through a little-noted provision that Congress wrote into the National Science Foundation Act last year: A medal for an "outstanding young scientist or engineer," accompanied by up to $150,000 over three years for research or advanced study.

The award, honoring the late Alan T. Waterman, founding director of NSF, was created in observance of the Foundation's 25th anniversary. Two or three finalists will be selected by a committee chaired by Melvin Calvin, director of the Laboratory of Chemical Dynamics, University of California, at Berkeley, and the winner will be named by the National Science Board, NSF's policymaking body.

To be awarded annually, the medal and money are intended for scientists and engineers who "have completed sufficient scientific or engineering research to have demonstrated, through personal accomplishments, outstanding capability and exceptional promise for significant future achievement."

In regard to the Congressional directive for honoring a "young" researcher, NSF states that "It is anticipated that recipients generally will not be over 40 years of age."

The annual ceiling for the three-year award is $50,000, but the language suggests that lesser amounts may be given.

Nominations should be in by March 19. Details may be obtained from the Alan T. Waterman Award Committee, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550. The presentation is scheduled for May 20.

Though the federal government gives out medals and financial awards for scientific and engineering achievements, this is said to be the first award that combines recognition with funds for future work.

AAAS *(Continued from Page 1)*

role in dealing with such issues? What responses have we in fact received from the societies? How many have responded positively? Will those who do respond actually follow through with suitable and continuing action?"

Note was taken of the fact that the American Chemical Society had developed a program for protecting the rights and freedoms of its members, and that this included a legal defense fund to provide low-interest loans for its members.

The workshop, however, concluded that "The length of time and the costs involved in carrying through even extra-legal procedures in defense of these scientific freedoms can be considerable, particularly if, as is nesessary, the requirements of due process are to be followed."

The odyssey of the AAAS and scientific freedom and responsibility next proceeded to the 142d annual meeting here, February 18-24, where the recommendations of the workshop were presented to the AAAS Council, which represents the affiliated societies and is just one notch below the governing Board.

The vote of the Council was to "endorse a move to establish together with the Board a committee for appropriate followup on the report of the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility." The Council also directed its Committee on Council Affairs to consider the wording of an amendment to the AAAS charter that would make the promotion of scientific freedom and responsibility one of the organization's basic tasks.

The issue next passes to the Board, which, after all these years of agonizing, is almost certain to accept the recommendations. Informally, it has already been decided to assign a fulltime staff member to the Committee, which is a sign of serious intent on the part of the financially hardpressed AAAS.

Is any of this likely to make a difference in the protection of scientific freedom and responsibility?

The answer is that nothing much is likely to happen quickly, since inertia and caution are dominant forces within the AAAS. Little, if anything, can happen within the organization without the participation of a sluggish assembly line of committees, subcommittees, panels, and various other deliberative appurtenances. Nevertheless, in its own glacial fashion, the AAAS has committed itself to an interest in the task, and though many of its constituent societies are little more than a mail drop and a membership list, they will be required to make at least a nod toward the protection of their members.

And it is possible that, just as the seemingly tame requirement for impact statements has become the major weapon of the environmental movement, the requirement for a protective role on the part of the AAAS's affiliates may produce powerful results. The effect will be to establish forums to which scientists with a grievance can look for relief. And since there are lots of such scientists and few forums at present, the outcome might be explosive. —DSG

European Biologists Endorse US Genetic Research Curbs

London. Regulations to control potentially hazardous genetic manipulation experiments, now nearing final form in the United States, have been endorsed by a committee of senior European biologists (SGR Vol. VI, No. 3). The committee, a special panel of the European Molecular Biology Organization (EMBO), discussed the proposed US regulations at a meeting last month, and it will soon issue a statement suggesting that they be implemented in Europe.

EMBO's action, though it carries no legislative weight, could be influential on both sides of the Atlantic. The EMBO committee has concluded that the latest draft of USA regulations, hammered out by an NIH committee last December, is more than strict enough to protect public health, and that it would be acceptable in Europe only if it is not made any more restrictive.

The US draft is now being considered by NIH Director Donald S. Fredrickson, who will decide in the next few weeks whether it should be accepted and implemented, or further revised. EMBO's endorsement of the draft could be influential in his decision, since it would clearly be advantageous for worldwide controls on the research to be relatively consistent.

The experiments involve the use of newly discovered enzymes to transplant genes from living organisms into viruses or bacteria, and the regulations are aimed at preventing the modified micro-organisms from escaping into the environment. In brief, the regulations proposed in the US would outlaw some of the more hazardous experiments and require the use of special safety precautions for others. In particular, they would require that many experiments be carried out on crippled bacteria or viruses which are incapable of surviving outside the laboratory.

The EMBO committee will recommend that, if the regulations are to be implemented in Europe, national committees should be established to review grant applications and ensure that proposed experiments conform to the regulations. In addition, EMBO will suggest that an international committee be formed to discuss problem cases.

The EMBO committee itself has also offered to provide technical advice to European governments on safety precautions for genetic manipulation experiments, and it would be prepared to offer assistance to individual scientists who are preparing to undertake such experiments.

A potential problem area in Europe is the question of who will certify that experimental strains of viruses or bacteria have been crippled sufficiently to provide an effective safety barrier. The NIH committee which drafted the US regulations will perform that function in the United States, and US strains will be made available worldwide. But new strains developed in Europe would require certification. EMBO suggests that such responsibility should rest with national committees, but again, it is prepared to offer its assistance. EMBO, moreover, has recommended that European centers be established through which modified strains could be disseminated to researchers.

A few European countries, including Britain, are already drafting their own regulations, and it is unlikely that they will adopt the US controls lock, stock and barrel. Nevertheless, they would probably be willing to take part in an international committee to ensure that controls are applied consistently throughout Europe.—CN

Science Bill Remains Stalled

Legislation to reopen a White House science office remains stalled in Congress.

With both houses having passed bills that contain substantially different provisions (SGR Vol. VI, No. 3), the next step for getting on with it calls for the House to appoint its side of a conference committee. Then the Senate can act.

As of this writing, however, Chairman Olin Teague (D-Texas), of the House Science and Technology Committee, was recovering from the flu, and had not taken any action. The odds are that a compromise bill will be worked out, since no one wants to be blamed for scuttling the long-sought-for restoration of the office. But on the Senate side, it is apparent that if the matter can be dragged out into the busy election season and then quietly dropped, there will be no weeping.

Science & Government Report © 1976

Contributing Editors
Colin Norman, Pamela Moore

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July and August. Annual subscription: Institutions, $65 (two years, $120); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Social Science Report: Study Assails NSF Programs . . .

When Richard Atkinson, a psychologist who is deputy director of the National Science Foundation, asked the National Academy of Sciences last summer to evaluate NSF's social science activities, it was an open invitation for behavioral and social scientists to air their longstanding frustrations with NSF (SGR Vol. V, No. 14). From the looks of the NAS review panel's recently issued interim report, they responded with zeal.

The result is a document that puts on record a lot of the informal complaints heard for years from social science quarters. It puffs the disciplines, criticizes many aspects of NSF administration and assails the profession's stepchild status. The panel, headed by Carnegie-Mellon psychologist Herbert Simon, states its biases from the start.

The panel is not a "citizens committee," the report's preface emphasizes, "but a group of professional and social scientists" with decided opinions. "The fact that we have devoted our careers to scientific research, both basic and applied, and to teaching, means that there is nothing neutral about out attitudes toward science." With that warning, the report proceeds to find some fault with almost all of NSF's activities in the social sciences, particularly in applied fields.

NSF's basic research programs in the social and behavioral sciences do receive generally high praise. The quality of most research funded is "excellent" and while some changes are recommended, program emphasis is usually appropriate, the report states. But, applied research in NSF's program of Research Applied to National Needs (RANN) is knocked from one end to the other.

The panel contends that behavioral and social scientists by and large have been shut out of the program because it does not fit the way they do business, even though many RANN research assignments fall within those disciplines. It sharply criticizes the program's "top down" administration, characterized by program directors and "user" agencies calling all the shots. At the other end, most of RANN's research products, reports and state-of-the-art papers on social and behavioral topics are called "pedestrian."

The major problems with the program, the report says, stem from "the faulty assumption that the program must be planned from above, that projects must first be defined almost independently by the user community and the RANN staff, and that performers must then be induced to carry them out within a prestructured framework."

In addition to implying that the program reduces researchers to lackeys, the report states that its search for quick fixes and short-term problem-solving provides too little time to undertake valid work. The difference in procedures between RANN and the more familiar basic research programs means that performers are less often university researchers and more often non-profit or profit corporations.

There are existing groups of applied behavioral and social scientists involved with most of the research areas embraced by RANN, the report states. But because social research topics are scattered throughout RANN, there is no "clearcut scientific reference group for each program." The report recommends a total realignment of RANN programs to "correspond more closely with

(Continued on Page 5)

Solar Energy Institute Guidelines Delayed Again by ERDA

Plans for the Congressionally mandated Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI) are bogged down in a conflict between the budget trimmers in the Office of Management and Budget and the sponsoring agency, the Energy Research and Development Administration.

As a result, ERDA's schedule for issuing guidelines for locales that wish to compete in providing a site for the facility has shifted from October, to November, then to January, and now to no one knows when.

The size of SERI is yet to be worked out. But a figure of $50 million a year for operations by 1980 was suggested by a National Academy of Sciences committee that was set up to make recommendations on the matter (SGR Vol. V, No. 17).

ERDA appeared to like those recommendations, but OMB has raised the issue of whether SERI should be a major research facility or merely a clearinghouse for solar information.

Meanwhile, ERDA's assistant administrator for solar, geothermal, and advanced energy systems, John Teem, suddenly resigned in January, citing "personal reasons." His resignation was accompanied by an exchange of laudatory letters, but there is a lot of talk around Washington that he bailed out in a policy dispute concerning SERI. Teem's post is being filled on an acting basis by Robert L. Hirsch, director of the division of controlled thermonuclear research.

. . .Says Responsibilities of RANN Staff Should Be Cut

(Continued from Page 4)

the boundaries of the applied science disciplines." In addition, it proposes an alternative management style by which projects would emerge and be defined by the field and less would be left to NSF staff users.

In fact, though the panel mentions that RANN staffers complain they need more people, the report recommends a reduction of their load by giving them fewer responsibilities. And, the report points out that as far as staffing is concerned, while social and behavioral science research projects are run by administrators with training in the disciplines, mixed projects with some social research component lack social science staff. In addition, the report notes that there are almost no social scientists at high levels in RANN.

RANN officials have previously fielded informal criticisms along similar lines by stating that it is difficult to get social scientists to work on interdisciplinary problems with other scientists, that they are not interested in the applied problems emphasized by RANN, and that social scientists do not want to be involved unless they can run the show. Some of that is "possible," according to the report. However, the panel suggests that an "adequate supply of competent social and behavioral scientists" is ready to go on applied research problems, given a more congenial program.

As of now, however, it states "the organization is structured to identify applications in search of science, rather than science in search of applications."

Although most of the panel's ire was reserved for RANN, the basic research program came in for some criticism as well. The major problem is inadequate funding, the report states: good ideas go unsupported; large-scale, ambitious and big-budget projects are discouraged or rejected; and senior investigators as well as newcomers are feeling the pinch. Only about nine per cent of the NSF basic research budget goes to behavioral and social science work, it adds, and that is only about one-third the support accorded other sciences. Costly but important longitudinal research, cross-cultural study, data collection projects and other work are being sacrificed for lack of money, it states.

The report complains that the NSF social science staff has not aggressively sold the disciplines at higher levels in the Foundation, and it recommends better lobbying. In addition to more funds, the panel also makes a pitch for support of some special facilities on a par with the national laboratories of other sciences to provide a setting for large-scale, interdisciplinary work in major research areas.

Aside from funding, the group strongly recommends amending the peer review setup in basic research programs to follow the NIH model. All programs should have outside panels and proposals should be ranked as well as evaluated, the panel says.

Although the panel's final report will not be in until

(Continued on Page 6)

In Quotes: Wiesner on Freedom, Technology

With anti-technology sentiments gaining popularity — as seen in opposition to nuclear power and the granting of landing rights to the SST — the pros are working hard to develop rationales that will have public appeal. One of the most inventive arrivals in this genre is contained in a talk that MIT President Jerome B. Wiesner delivered in Boston February 20 to the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Following is an excerpt:

During the first phase of the technological-industrial revolution the new technologies caused major and largely unexpected changes in the situation of the typical citizen of an industrializing nation. Now new technologies are more likely to be undertaken to maintain or improve slightly previous achievements as in the case of the search for new energy sources or the efforts to improve air quality. Now, with the exception of the life sciences, and the computer and communications sciences, the likelihood of producing violent discontinuities by the introduction of new technologies is small. In fact, discontinuities are much more likely to be of a degenerative character, and result from the failure to have new technologies available when needed. The failure, for example, to develop alternative energy sources, or adequate water resources or new pesticides or the failure to develop adequate new raw material sources as old ones are used up could have very damaging effects. Such technological failures could lead to major political discontinuities as well. Many political observers are pessimistic about the ability of a democratic state to manage the complex problems of a resource-short industrial society. If you accept their conclusions, freedom itself rests on our ability to create adequate new technologies.

AAAS Staff Chief Urges Hands off Magazine

Boston. The elders of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) have signalled to their newly installed president, William D. McElroy, that he is to keep his reformist paws off the Association's esteemed journal, *Science.*

McElroy, who is chancellor of the University of California at San Deigo, caused a sudden spurt in the AAAS's longdistance phone bill when the *New York Times* reported in January that he desired more "straight reporting" and "less opinion" in the News and Comment section of *Science.* McElroy was also quoted as saying that the journal ought to consider the possibility of stopping publication of pure research papers, particularly in biology, and replace them with material that would help attract a broader audience (SGR Vol. VI, No. 1).

McElroy has since complained privately that he was misquoted, though when SGR summarized the *Times* account for him in a telephone interview immediately following publication, he did not dispute its accuracy.

In any case, the matter was not directly addressed in public at the AAAS's annual meeting here, February 18-24. But with McElroy sitting on the stage at a meeting of the AAAS Council, Executive Officer William D. Carey, who also serves as publisher of *Science,* used the occasion to proclaim his confidence in the journal. Since the meeting went unnoted by the general press and the issue is too close to home to qualify for coverage in *Science,* SGR, as a service to the scientific public and its brethren and sisters in News and Comment, concludes it would be useful to record Carey's emergence as the John Peter Zenger of scientific journalism. The reason is that, while News and Comment is perhaps the brightest jewel in the prestigous journal, its searchlight on the scientific community frequently irritates influential statesmen who prefer to do the family laundry in private. Since they have their ways of trying to get at the cause of their ire, the Carey statement constitutes a shield whose existence ought to be known beyond a ballroom at the Sheraton-Boston.

"As publisher of *Science,* as well as chief operating officer of the AAAS," Carey stated, my mail frequently reminds me of our imperfections. Along with occasional bouquets, there comes a stream of criticism of the journal. Some of it is from authors who feel victimized by the treatment they have received at the hands of peer reviewers. In other cases, the target is the News and Comment Department, whose writers seem to strike home and occasionally hit a nerve. Its reporters have been accused, at times, of sensationalism and bias. I have made it a practice to take up each complaint of this nature with the editors and to reply personally to every letter which is not mere invective. As I see it, the problem of News and Comment — if there is a problem — is inevitable where a single journal undertakes to combine straightforward communication in science with journalistic reporting and news analysis.

"Toes are bound to be stepped on if the reporters not only tell the news but also comment on it, and I have not thought it my function as publisher to manage the news or alter its analysis. Each news story is signed by the reporter who wrote it, and there is accountability. As to the accusation of bias, it is a very difficult thing to prove or disprove. The writers for News and Comment are expected to have open minds, but their job is both to report and analyze what is going on, to remember that they are working for a respected journal which is the communications voice of the Association, and to be very sure of their ground. In my judgment, the News and Comment section of *Science* holds an unrivalled position in American journalism, and it has earned it.

"As for the peer review procedure as it is practiced by *Science* for refereeing manuscripts, one is hard put to imagine a workable substitute. The journal would be hopelessly mired without it. Some 8,000 people serve as peer reviewers, generously and without compensation. Although the peer review system has no guarantee of infallibility, nor immunity to human error and occasional injustice, it gets the job done, year in and year out. Perhaps we can improve on our version of peer review. It may be that we give peer rankings more conclusive weight than we should. Perhaps we should turn over the list of reviewers more often. In the coming months we will look into these and other aspects of the referee system and welcome constructive suggestions. But there

(Continued on Page 7)

SOCIAL SCIENCES *(Continued from Page 5)*

early summer, most of the points contained in the interim report should stand. And, Atkinson predicts that it should carry some weight with the National Science Board. Even if it does not, it has managed to voice many of the gripes behavioral and social scientists have uttered privately for years. —PM

(The report, 96 pages, is titled, "The Social and Behavioral Science Programs in the National Science Foundation." It is available without charge, in limited quantities, from the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC. 20418).

RESIGNATIONS *(Continued from Page 8)*

decisions independently, but rumors are circulating that they were "turned around" by a little known, well-heeled California organization that specializes in re-casting the attitudes of technocrats.

Within that same week, three young attorneys for the Environmental Protection Agency publicly resigned "because of the continued failure of the EPA to take effective action" against hazardous substances, particularly pesticides in food, air, and water.

The attorneys, all assigned to the regulation of pesticides and toxic substances, are Jeffry H. Howard, 31; William E. Reukauf, 31, and Frank J. Sizemore III, 29. In a joint statement, they said, "It is clear from recent actions that the agency intends to refrain from vigorous enforcement of available toxic-substances controls and to retrench from the few legal precedents which it has set for evaluating cancer hazards posed by chemicals."

"The regulatory inaction and contemplated retrenchment," they charged, is "attributable in part to industry pressure brought to bear through congressional committees and to election-year politics."

Assuming the absence of independent means, the resigned engineers and lawyers have taken a plunge that is likely to involve financial difficulties. The anti-nuclear movement to which the engineers have volunteered their efforts may be vigorous, but it is not affluent; nor are jobs plentiful for people with their skills. The lawyers have indicated that they may go into the private practice of environmental law. With occasional exceptions, however, it is the forces that precipitated their resignations that have the money for retainers and litigation. The environmental movement tends to operate on minuscule budgets.

There is a temptation, of course, to propose that an angel come forward with transition grants for meritorious defectors from the bureaucracy. However, if privately voiced discontent is any measure of the potential market, not even the Ford Foundation treasury could bankroll a system for institutionalizing resignation on principle.

It's going to remain cold out there, which is one reason why such resignations are rare and usually brave. —DSG

SCIENCE *(Continued from Page 6)*

is no liklihood that we will alter its fundamentals.

"*Science* continues to be a primary news source for science writers throughout the country. In 1975 hundreds of clippings were received from other publications based on articles in *Science*. While most of these were based on the Reports, a growing number seemed to come from the News and Comment section.

"Clearly, the AAAS has a very strong asset in *Science*. Our responsibility is to preserve and enhance it, and to be certain that its credibility and editorial standards are not diminished in any way. Within those ground rules, the journal can continue its record of innovation and self-improvement to the benefit of the Association, its readers, and advertisers."

Lag in Women's Salary Growth

Salaries paid to full-time teachers at colleges and universities increased last year by 6.1 per cent, according to preliminary figures released by the Office of Education. The figures indicate that at every academic rank, women continue to be paid less than men. The gap, moreover, is increasing, since salaries for men increased by 6.3 per cent, while those paid to women increased by only 5.8 per cent.

There is also evidence that the upward movement of women on the academic ladder has slowed. Though the overall percentage of women among faculty on teaching contracts remained constant at 24 per cent last year, the proportion of women professors declined, from 10.1 per cent to 9.8 per cent, while the proportion of women at the rank of lecturer increased, from 38.9 to 39.6 per cent.

Ford Renominates Humanities Head

President Ford has nominated Ronald Berman for a second four-year term as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Berman, 45, was appointed in 1971 by President Nixon.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $65☐ ; two years, $120☐

Individual subscribers: one year, $44☐ ; two years, $75☐

(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name_____

Address_____

_____

Zip

Resignations in Protest: A Vintage Year?

Since grousing about principle is one of the most prevalent but least acted upon facets of involvement in public affairs, it should be noted that 1976 is off to a promising start as a vintage year for job resignations on issues of principle.

Spotty data collection makes year-to-year comparisons difficult, but it is SGR's impression that last year was a wipeout, save for the stormy departure of Dixy Lee Ray from a brief mismatch with the State Department (SGR Vol. V, No. 13).

However, with the New Year only two months old, the chronicle of principled resignations already includes a Cabinet officer, Labor Secretary John T. Dunlop, who exited after President Ford doublecrossed him and vetoed a bill that sanctioned common situs picketing. Dunlop comfortably repaired to a waiting professorship at Harvard, a fallback maneuver that minimized the heroics of his action. But elsewhere and all within a matter of weeks, there have been seven other resignations that are noteworthy for being of the less-cushioned variety.

The most recent occurred February 9, when the federal engineer responsible for safety at the Indian Point, NY, nuclear installation, Robert D. Pollard, 36, resigned from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, declaring: "I believe that the Indian Point nuclear power station constitutes an unconscionable threat to the health and safety of the millions of people who live in the metropolitan New York area."

Pollard said, "The Indian Point plants have been badly designed and constructed and are susceptible to accidents that could cause large-scale loss of life and other radiation injuries, such as cancer and birth defects"— charges that were immediately denied by Consolidated Edison and the NRC.

In announcing his resignation, which was reported on the front page of the *New York Times,* Pollard said he would start work soon as Washington representative of the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Massachusetts-based group that has long been questioning the safety of nuclear power. He said his salary would be about two-thirds of the $27,756 he received from the NRC.

Pollard's resignation came about a week after three $30,000-$40,000-a-year General Electric engineers in California quit work on nuclear power and volunteered their services to the anti-nuclear movement. Fathers of three children each, the three had accumulated a total of 54 years with GE's nuclear energy division, and, at the time of their resignations, held middle-management posts with extensive responsibilities for developing nuclear power.

The three—Dale G. Bridenbaugh, 44; Gregory C. Minor, 38, and Richard B. Hubbard, 38—all cited doubts about the safety of nuclear power as their reasons for resigning. Representative of their public explanations was a statement by Hubbard, who was manager for quality assurance of GE's nuclear energy control and instrumentations department: "I am now convinced that there is no way you can continue to build plants and operate them without having an accident."

The three have said publicly that they made their

(Continued on Page 7)

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

Xerox Univ. Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, Mich 48106